

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 9, 2008. Claims 11 to 33, 38 to 40, 42 to 46, 48 to 51 and 53 to 71 are in the application, of which the following claims are independent: Claims 11, 26, 30, 38, 40, 42, 43, 46, 48, 49, 51 and 53. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for his withdrawal of formal objections and formal rejections, which had been entered in a prior Office Action.

The instant Office Action maintains art-based rejections that had been entered in the prior Office Action. Thus, Claims 38 to 40, 42 to 46 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent 5,943,050 (Bullock). Claims 49 to 51 and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,522,354 (Kawamura). The remaining claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kawamura in view of Bullock and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,706,097 (Schelling).

In maintaining these rejections, pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action explain the USPTO's position that there is nothing in the claims to indicate that "the display must be separate from the camera". Applicants respectfully submit that such a position fails to afford proper significance to language already found in the claims. For example, the rejected claims include explicit recitations of various "interfaces" to which the digital camera is connectable. These claims further recite a variety of functionalities and information that is exchanged via these interfaces. Claim 11, for example, specifies that a

computer includes an interface to which a digital camera is connectable and an interface to which a printer is connectable, and further specifies that the computer executes a displaying step, a controlling step to control settings of the digital camera via the interface thereto, a downloading step to download image files from the digital camera via the interface thereto, and a printing step to send a print job to the printer via the interface thereto. All these steps are performed by a computer, and it is not seen how such steps could be performed by a computer other than a computer in which a display is separate from the camera.

Pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action further explain the USPTO's interpretation for recitations such as those found in Claim 38, which recites "means for detecting a connection of the device to the interface". According to the Office Action, the USPTO is interpreting these recitations as nothing more than a "double clicking of a camera icon". Applicants are respectfully constrained to disagree with this interpretation, and respectfully point out that such an interpretation again fails to afford proper significance to language found in the claims. For example, such an interpretation apparently ignores the recitation of an interface to which a device is connectable.

In an effort to underscore the separate nature of the various devices involved, as well as to underscore the concept of a connection to and a disconnection from an interface, the claims herein have been amended so as to specify that the device (or digital camera) is "disconnectably connectable" to the interface. In addition, dependent claims have been added so as to emphasize the feature of detecting a disconnection of the device (or digital camera) from the interface. Such a feature is described throughout the

specification, such as the description of the port monitor application that monitors a serial port for disconnection of a digital camera once the camera has been detected. See page 17, lines 26 through 31.

In view of these changes, Applicants respectfully reassert each of the arguments made in the Amendment dated January 8, 2008. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Michael K. O'Neill", written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicants  
Michael K. O'Neill  
Registration No. 32,622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS\_WS 2304713v1